



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,573	10/09/2001	Christopher J. Stone	018926-008600US	6032
20350	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			JONES III, CLYDE H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/973,573	Applicant(s) STONE, CHRISTOPHER J.	
	Examiner Clyde H. Jones III	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/6/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's arguments on pages 9-11 of the 1/6/2006 amendment, the newly added limitations are met by the Das, Arsenault, and Croy references as described below.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: On claim 11, line 4 the phrase "comprising programs a subscribed to by a user" should be changed to -- comprising programs subscribed to by a user--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 15-18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Das et al. (US 6,493,688 B1).

Art Unit: 2611

In regards to claim 1 Das discloses –

A method of providing program information (col. 3, lines 43-59), said method comprising:

obtaining a list of programs offered for viewing (col. 3, lines 43-46; in which Das' EPG reads on a "list of programs offered for viewing");

determining a subset of the list of programs comprising programs [a] subscribed (Examiner interprets subscribed to mean favored or consent) to by a user , the subset excluding programs not subscribed to by the user (col. 5, lines 4-11 & lines 23-27 & lines 38-39; col. 5, lines 57-64 & lines 58-59).

compiling at a content provider device (TV-set, Fig. 1 or STB) a second list of programs comprising the subset (col. 5, lines 4-59; in which the profile module, EPG module and ZAP-control module provide a "zap-list" which is also filtered using a selected profile indicating programs subscribed/favored by the user, creating a shortened/concise second list excluding unfavored channels/programs; and col. 3, lines 10-15; in which the TV-set receives signals/program content from the cable network, e.g., a head-end provides television signals/program content to the TV-sets on the cable network); and

communicating the second list to a remote controller (col. 5, line 67- col. 6, line 5; in which the filtered EPG list, i.e., the second list is sent to a remote control).

Art Unit: 2611

In regards to claim 2, Das discloses compiling the second list at a set-top box (col. 5, line 67- col. 6, line 5; in which the EPG list is filtered at the STB prior to sending the filtered list, i.e., the second list to the remote control).

In regards to claim 15, Das discloses—

An apparatus for providing program information (col. 3, lines 10-51), said apparatus comprising:

- a processor (CPU 8 – Fig. 1);

- a memory coupled to the processor (ROM 14 or RAM 13);

- a display coupled to said processor (screen 6);

- code operable to obtain a list of programs offered for viewing (col. 3, lines 19-28; in which Das' EPG reads on a "list of programs offered for viewing");

- code operable to store a plurality of user profiles (col. 3, lines 59-62);

- code operable to select one of the plurality of user profiles (col. 3, line 66 – col.4, line 3);

- code operable to utilize the selected user profile to identify a subset of the list of programs comprising programs subscribed (Examiner interprets subscribed to mean favored or consent) to by a user associated with the selected user profile, the subset excluding programs not subscribed to by the user (col. 5, lines 4-11 & lines 23-27 & lines 38-39; col. 5, lines 57-64 & lines 58-59);

- code operable to compile a second list of programs comprising the subset (col.5, lines 4-26 & lines 57-59; in which the profile module, EPG module and ZAP-control

Art Unit: 2611

module provide a “zap-list” which is also filtered using a selected profile indicating programs subscribed/favored by the user, creating a shortened/concise second list excluding unfavored channels/programs); and

code operable to display the second list on said display (col. 5, lines 4-26 and lines 57-59).

In regards to claim 16, Das discloses—

code operable to allow the user to remove a program (col. 5, lines 8-25; in which the filtered/second list generated using a selected user profile does not include programs on channels eliminated by the user’s ratings/settings).

In regards to claim 17, Das discloses—

code operable to select at least one of the plurality of user profiles (col. 3, line 66 – col.4, line 3).

In regards to claim 18, Das discloses—

code operable to utilize the profile to compile the second list (col.5, lines 4-26 & lines 57-59; in which the profile module, EPG module and ZAP-control module provide a “zap-list” which is filtered using a selected profile, creating a shortened/concise second list).

In regards to claim 20, Das discloses—

Art Unit: 2611

code operable to compile the second list without programs previously removed by said user (col. 5, lines 8-25; in which the filtered/second list generated using a selected user profile does not include programs on channels eliminated by the user's ratings/settings; profiles are saved/updated so that previous profile settings remain in effect for the selected profile).

In regards to claim 21, Das discloses—

code operable to compile the second list without programs not subscribed to by the user (col. 5, lines 38-39 & lines 4-10; in which the EPG list only programs for which the user subscribes, i.e., authorizes the profile, EPG and zap control modules to list through user ratings/settings).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al. (US 6,493,688 B1) in view of Croy et al. (US 6,509,908 B1).

Regarding claim 3, Das discloses the transmission of protected personal information (col. 6, lines 32-34; col. 4, lines 11-15). However, Das fails to disclose the limitation “determining said list from cryptographic information for said list of programs”.

In an analogous art Croy discloses encrypted (cryptographic) information is used to determine EPG information, i.e., menus or lists, and provide it to a STB (Fig.1) or Remote Control (Fig. 2 & 3A) for more secure communication (col. 5, line 61 - col. 6, line 29; col. 3, lines 17-20; col. 7, lines 43-47; in which lists are received by the base station from a content provider such as a head-end or Internet server).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Das to include the further limitation, “determining said list from cryptographic information for said list of programs”, as taught by Croy for more secure communication and customer identification (Croy- col. 6, 27-37).

Regarding claim 19, Das discloses code operable to password-protect profiles and exclude programs rated below a threshold (col. 4, lines 13-15; col. 5, lines 38-39). However Das fails to disclose the further limitation, “utilize parental control settings in compiling said list”.

In an analogous art Croy discloses use of profiles and password-protected lists so children can not view certain channels or programs above or below a threshold, e.g., parents set a password-protected profile for their children so they can not view gratuitous programs (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 8 line 66 – col. 9, line 1).

Art Unit: 2611

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Das to include the further limitation, "utilize parental control settings in compiling said list" as taught by Croy for preventing children from watching gratuitous or unsuitable (exceeding a threshold) material (col. 7, lines 1-5).

5. Claims 4-8, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al. (US 6,493,688 B1) in view of Arsenault (US 6,980,529 B1).

In regards to claim 4, Das discloses –

A method of providing program information (col. 3, lines 43-59), said method comprising:

obtaining a list of programs offered for viewing by a user (col. 3, lines 43-59; in which Das' EPG reads on a "list of programs offered for viewing by a user");

communicating said list of programs to a remote controller (col. 5, lines 60-65);

determining a subset of the list of programs comprising programs accessible to the user (col. 5, lines 57-64; col. 6, lines 15-21; col. 5, lines 20-27; in which the user's profile filters programs the user watches/accesses for display in the EPG).

compiling at said remote controller a second list of comprising the subset (col. 5, lines 57-64; col. 6, lines 15-37; in which Das teaches the ZAP-control module, EPG module and profile module are "entirely" located in the remote control, i.e., the remote control is operable to filter a received EPG list using a profile to create a "zap-list", i.e.,

Art Unit: 2611

create a second list, which the user browses on the remote control display and the remote control is arranged so that only channels identified by the profile are listed);

displaying said second list of programs on said remote controller (col. 6, lines 8-12; in which profile filtered EPG data, i.e., the second list is viewed on the remote control's display).

Das further discloses a zap circle of receivable/ordered channels (col. 5, lines 6-9), and that additional components are needed to decode certain content, e.g., some programs/services may not be accessed because the STB does not have the needed components (col. 5, lines 49-56). Das further teaches the advantage of the invention is providing a EPG on the remote control when the TV/STB is incapable of providing certain EPG components (col. 6, lines 25-28) and further that the EPG/profile can be made more precise by using more than one program attribute value to filter programs from the EPG (col. 6, lines 49-51).

However, Das fails to specifically disclose the subset excluding programs not accessible to the user.

In an analogous art Arsenault teaches the subset excluding programs not accessible (available) to the user (col. 5, lines 49-61) to avoid frustrating the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the system of Das to include the subset excluding

Art Unit: 2611

programs not accessible to the user as taught by Arsenault for the added advantages of enhancing user comfort and increased efficiency of memory (Arsenault – col. 5, lines 58-60; col. 8, lines 26-29).

In regards to claim 5, Das discloses allowing the user to remove channels so as not to appear on the second list of programs (col. 5, lines 20-26; in which Das discloses a user can select a profile in which a whole channel is omitted/removed, thereby removing them from the filtered EPG list, i.e., the second list of programs).

In regards to claim 6, Das discloses selecting a profile of the user (col. 4, lines 11-13; col. 5, line 20).

In regards to claim 7, Das discloses utilizing said selected profile for the compiling of the second list of programs (col. 5, lines 20-26).

In regards to claim 8, Das discloses—

determining whether a control has been set for the user corresponding to at least one of the programs (col. 4, lines 16-50; in which the profile module distinguishes programs by determining whether a positive rating/setting, which controls the display of channels/programs, has been assigned to a field associated with a program);

and if the control has been set for the user, removing the control from the second list (col. 4, lines 45-46; in which Das discloses, controls/settings previously set are

Art Unit: 2611

overridden/removed by subsequent changes to the earlier settings, e.g., the user's preference for a program changes so the user removes/negative rates a previously positive (acceptable) program).

In regards to claim 10, Das discloses—

compiling the second list so as not to comprise programs that had been eliminated by the user (col. 5, lines 8-25; in which the filtered/second list generated using a selected user profile does not include programs on channels eliminated by the user's ratings/settings; profiles are saved/updated so that previous profile settings remain in effect for the selected profile).

In regards to claim 11, Das discloses—

compiling said list so as not to comprise programs to which the user does not subscribe (col. 5, lines 38-39 & lines 4-10; in which the EPG list only programs for which the user subscribes, i.e., authorizes the profile, EPG and zap control modules to list through user ratings/settings).

In regards to claim 12, Das discloses—

A method of providing program information (col. 3, lines 43-59), the method comprising:

obtaining a list of programs offered for viewing (col. 3, lines 43-46; in which Das' EPG reads on a "list of programs offered for viewing");

Art Unit: 2611

storing a plurality of user profiles (col.3, lines 59-67);

selecting at least one of the plurality of user profiles (col. 4, lines 1-13);

utilizing the selected user profile to identify a subset of the list of programs comprising programs accessible to a user associated with the selected user profile (col. 5, lines 57-64; col. 6, lines 15-21; col. 5, lines 20-27; in which the user's profile filters programs the user watches/accesses for display in the EPG);

compiling a second list of programs comprising the subset (col. 5, lines 4-26 & lines 52-59; in which the profile module and the EPG module filter received program information to provide a shorter/concise "zap list" which only channels identified by the profile are listed);

displaying the second list on a remote controller (col. 6, lines 6-13).

Das further discloses a zap circle of receivable/ordered channels (col. 5, lines 6-9), and that additional components are needed to decode certain content, e.g., some programs/services may not be accessed because the STB does not have the needed components (col. 5, lines 49-56). Das further teaches the EPG/profile can be made more precise by using more than one program attribute value to filter programs from the EPG (col. 6, lines 49-51).

However, Das fails to specifically disclose the subset excluding programs not accessible to the user.

Art Unit: 2611

In an analogous art Arsenault teaches the subset excluding programs not accessible (available) to the user (col. 5, lines 49-61) to avoid frustrating the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the system of Das to include the subset excluding programs not accessible to the user as taught by Arsenault for the added advantages of enhancing user comfort and increased efficiency of memory (Arsenault – col. 5, lines 58-60; col. 8, lines 26-29).

In regards to claim 13, Das discloses—

compiling the second list at a set-top box (col. 5, line 67- col. 6, line 5; in which the EPG list is filtered at the STB prior to sending the filtered list, i.e., the second list to the remote control);

and communicating the second list to the remote controller (col. 5, line 67- col. 6, line 5; in which the filtered EPG list, i.e., the second list is sent to the remote control).

In regards to claim 14, Das discloses—

compiling the second list with the remote controller (col. 5, lines 57-64; col. 6, lines 15-37; in which Das teaches the ZAP-control module, EPG module and profile module are “entirely” located in the remote control to control TVs and STBs that do not support EPGs or profiles, e.g., the remote control is operable to filter a received EPG list using a profile to create a “zap-list”, i.e., a second list, which the user browses on the

Art Unit: 2611

remote control display and the remote control is arranged so that only channels with high rated programs, i.e., programs the viewer likes, can be selected).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al. (US 6,493,688 B1) in view of Arsenault (US 6,980,529 B1) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Croy et al. (US 6,509,908 B1).

Regarding claim 9, Das in view of Arsenault teach password-protected profiles and excluding programs rated below a threshold (Das -col. 4, lines 13-15; col. 5, lines 38-39).

However Das fails to disclose the further limitation, "comprises a parental control".

In an analogous art Croy discloses use of profiles and password-protected lists so children can not view certain channels or programs above or below a threshold, e.g., parents set a password-protected profile for their children so they can not view gratuitous programs (col. 7, lines 1-5; col. 8 line 66 – col. 9, line 1).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the system of Das in view of Arsenault to include the further limitation, "comprises a parental control" as taught by Croy for preventing children from watching gratuitous or unsuitable (exceeding a threshold) material (Croy - col. 7, lines 1-5).

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2611

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clyde H. Jones III whose telephone number is 571-272-5946. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30 p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CJ



CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800